

HAUSDORFF DIMENSION OF A CLASS OF THREE-INTERVAL EXCHANGE MAPS

D. Karagulyan^{*}

ABSTRACT. In [5] Bourgain proves that Sarnak's disjointness conjecture holds for a certain class of Three-interval exchange maps. In the present paper we estimate the constants in Bourgain's proof and subsequently estimate the measure of the parameter set in his result. We show, that it has positive, but not full Hausdorff dimension. This, in particular, implies that the Lebesgue measure of this set is zero.

1. INTRODUCTION

intro

Let μ denote the Möbius function, i.e.

$$\mu(n) = \begin{cases} (-1)^k & \text{if } n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k \text{ for distinct primes } p_k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In [25], [24] Sarnak introduced the following conjecture. Recall that a topological dynamical system (Y, T) is a compact metric space Y with a homeomorphism $T : Y \rightarrow Y$, and the topological entropy $h(Y, T)$ of such a system is defined as

$$h(Y, T) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log N(\epsilon, n),$$

where $N(\epsilon, n)$ is the largest number of ϵ -separated points in Y using the metric $d_n : Y \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by

$$d_n(x, y) = \max_{0 \leq i \leq n} d(T^i x, T^i y).$$

A sequence $f : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is said to be deterministic if it is of the form

$$f(n) = F(T^n x),$$

for all n and some topological dynamical system (Y, T) with zero topological entropy $h(Y, T) = 0$, a base point $x \in Y$, and a continuous function $F : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

con1

Conjecture 1. *Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a deterministic sequence. Then*

f0

$$(1.1) \quad S_n(T(x), f) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \mu(k) f(k) = o(1).$$

The conjecture, called Moebius orthogonality, is known to be true for several dynamical systems. For a Kronecker flow (that is a translation on a compact abelian group) it is proved in [27] and [8] and these results predate Sarnak's conjecture and the methods are number-theoretical. When (X, T) is a translation on a compact nilmanifold it is proved in [17]. In [4] it is established also for horocycle flows. For

^{*}Department of Mathematics, Royal Institute of Technology, S-100 44 Stockholm, Sweden. Email: davitk@kth.se

orientation preserving circle-homeomorphisms and continuous interval maps of zero entropy the conjectures is proved in [20]. The conjecture has also been proved to hold in several other cases ([1], [2], [3]). Another natural class of dynamical systems are the interval exchange maps. In [5] Bourgain, using the dynamical description of trajectories in ([10]-[12]) and the Hardy-Littlewood circle method, shows that under a certain diophantine condition Conjecture 1 holds for a certain class of three-interval exchange maps. In this paper we slightly improve the diophantine condition obtained by Bourgain and estimate the Hausdorff dimension of the new parameter set (Theorem 6). We want to note, that using the criterion of Bourgain in [5] and the generalization of the self-dual induction defined in [15], for each primitive permutation, Ferenczi and Mauduit([14]) construct a large family of k -interval exchanges satisfying Sarnaks conjecture.

Recently Eskin and Chaika ([6]) proved the Moebius orthogonality for three interval exchange maps satisfying a certain mild diophantine condition. Even though their result holds for almost all three interval exchange maps, but the diophantine condition considered in their paper is essentially complementary to the one considered here. In [6] the continued fractions are required to have certain bound from above, while in Bourgain's method they need to be uniformly large. We note that Eskin and Chaika, in fact, give two proofs of the fact that the Moebius orthogonality holds almost surely for three-interval exchange maps, however the second proof does not provide explicit Diophantine condition. Their proof is based on the Katai-Bourgain-Sarnak-Ziegler [4] criterion, while Bourgain uses a direct approach.

The present paper is a part of the authors Ph.D. thesis.

2. THREE INTERVAL EXCHANGE MAPS

sec:2

The three-interval exchange transformation T with probability vector $(\alpha, \beta, 1 - (\alpha + \beta))$, $\alpha, \beta > 0$, $0 < \alpha < 1$, $0 < \beta < 1 - \alpha$, and permutation $(3, 2, 1)$ is defined by

$$T_{\alpha, \beta}(x) = \begin{cases} x + 1 - \alpha & \text{if } x \in [0, \alpha) \\ x + 1 - 2\alpha - \beta & \text{if } x \in [\alpha, \alpha + \beta) \\ x - \alpha - \beta & \text{if } x \in [\alpha + \beta, 1). \end{cases}$$

T depends only on the two parameters $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $0 < \beta < 1 - \alpha$. We note that T is continuous except at the points α and $\alpha + \beta$.

In order to present the main result of the paper we need to recall some facts and definitions from [10] and [5]. Set

$$A(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 + \beta}$$

and

$$B(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{1 + \beta}.$$

More precisely, T is obtained from the 2-interval exchange map R on $[0, 1)$ given by ([22],[21])

ind

$$(2.1) \quad R(x) = \begin{cases} x + A(\alpha, \beta), & \text{if } x \in [0, \alpha) \\ x + A(\alpha, \beta) - 1 & \text{if } x \in [1 - A(\alpha, \beta), 1), \end{cases}$$

by inducing (according to the first return map) on the subinterval $[0, B(\alpha, \beta)]$ and then renormalizing by scaling by $1 + \beta$. We say T satisfies the infinite distinct orbit condition (or i.d.o.c. for short) of Keane [22] if the two negative trajectories $\{T^{-n}(\alpha)\}_{n \geq 0}$ and $\{T^{-n}(\alpha + \beta)\}_{n \geq 0}$ of the discontinuities are infinite disjoint sets. Under this hypothesis, T is both minimal and uniquely ergodic; the unique invariant probability measure is the Lebesgue measure μ on $[0, 1)$ (and hence (X, T, μ) is an ergodic system).

Let I denote the open interval $(0, 1)$, $D_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ the simplex bounded by the lines $y = 0$, $x = 0$, and $x + y = 1$, and D the triangular region bounded by the lines $x = \frac{1}{2}$, $x + y = 1$, and $2x + y = 1$. Note that

$$D_0 = \{(\alpha, \beta) : \alpha, \beta > 0, 0 < \alpha < 1, 0 < \beta < 1 - \alpha\}.$$

We define two mappings on $I \times I$

$$F(x, y) = \left(\frac{2x - 1}{x}, \frac{y}{x} \right) \text{ and } G(x, y) = (1 - x - y, y).$$

One checks that if $(\alpha, \beta) \in D_0$ is not in D and is not on any of the rational lines $p\alpha + q\beta = p - q$, $p\alpha + q\beta = p - q + 1$, $p\alpha + q\beta = p - q - 1$ then there exists a unique finite sequence of integers $l_0, l_1, \dots, l_k$ such that (α, β) is in $H^{-1}D$, where H is a composition of the form $G^t \circ F^{l_0} \circ G \circ F^{l_1} \circ G \dots \circ G \circ F^{l_k} \circ G^s$, $s, t \in \{0, 1\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{H} = \{G^t \circ F^{l_0} \circ G \circ F^{l_1} \circ G \dots \circ G \circ F^{l_k} \circ G^s : s, t \in \{0, 1\} \text{ and } l_0, l_1, \dots, l_k \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

Clearly $\mathcal{H}$ is a countable set.

The function $H(\alpha, \beta)$ is computed recursively as follows: we start with $\alpha^{(0)} = \alpha$, $\beta^{(0)} = \beta$. Then, given $(\alpha^{(k)}, \beta^{(k)})$, we have three mutually exclusive possibilities: if $(\alpha^{(k)}, \beta^{(k)})$ is in D , the algorithm stops; if $\alpha^{(k)} < \frac{1}{2}$, we apply G ; if $2\alpha^{(k)} + \beta^{(k)} < 1$, we apply F .

Associated to each point $(\alpha, \beta) \in D_0$ there is a sequence $(n_k, m_k, \varepsilon_{k+1})_{k \geq 1}$, where n_k and m_k are positive integers, and ε_{k+1} is ± 1 . This sequence is called the three-interval expansion of (α, β) ; it is constructed as follows:

- For (α, β) in D let

$$x_0 = \frac{1 - \alpha - \beta}{1 - \alpha} \text{ and } y_0 = \frac{1 - 2\alpha}{1 - \alpha},$$

and define for $k \geq 0$

$$(x_{k+1}, y_{k+1}) = \begin{cases} \left(\left\{ \frac{y_k}{(x_k + y_k) - 1}, \frac{x_k}{(x_k + y_k) - 1} \right\} \right) & \text{if } x_k + y_k > 1 \\ \left(\left\{ \frac{1 - y_k}{1 - (x_k + y_k)}, \frac{1 - x_k}{1 - (x_k + y_k)} \right\} \right) & \text{if } x_k + y_k < 1. \end{cases}$$

$$(n_{k+1}, m_{k+1}) = \begin{cases} \left(\left[\frac{y_k}{(x_k + y_k) - 1} \right], \left[\frac{x_k}{(x_k + y_k) - 1} \right] \right) & \text{if } x_k + y_k > 1 \\ \left(\left[\frac{1 - y_k}{1 - (x_k + y_k)} \right], \left[\frac{1 - x_k}{1 - (x_k + y_k)} \right] \right) & \text{if } x_k + y_k < 1, \end{cases}$$

where $\{a\}$ and $[a]$ denote the fractional and integer part of a respectively. For $k \geq 0$ set

$$\varepsilon_{k+1} = \text{sgn}(x_k + y_k - 1).$$

- For $(\alpha, \beta) \notin D$ we let H be the function above for which $(\alpha, \beta) \in H^{-1}D$ and put

$$(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = H(\alpha, \beta),$$

and define $(n_k, m_k, \epsilon_{k+1})$ as in the previous case, starting from $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) \in D$.

In [10] the authors also prove the following propositions and theorem

propos1

Proposition 1 ([10, Proposition 2.1, (2)]). *An infinite sequence $(n_k, m_k, \epsilon_{k+1})$ is the expansion of at least one pair (α, β) defining a T satisfying the i.d.o.c. condition, if and only if n_k and m_k are positive integers, $\epsilon_{k+1} = \pm 1$, $(n_k, \epsilon_{k+1}) \neq (1, +1)$ for infinitely many k and $(m_k, \epsilon_{k+1}) \neq (1, +1)$ for infinitely many k .*

propos

Proposition 2 ([10, Proposition 2.1, (4)]). *For $(\alpha, \beta) \in D_0$, let $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = H(\alpha, \beta)$ as above, then*

$$A(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = \frac{1 - \bar{\alpha}}{1 + \bar{\beta}} = \frac{1}{2 + \frac{1}{m_1 + n_1 - \frac{\epsilon_2}{m_2 + n_2 - \frac{\epsilon_3}{m_3 + n_3 - \ddots}}}}.$$

Ft

Theorem 1 ([10, Theorem 2.2]). *Let T satisfy the i.d.o.c. condition, and let $(n_k, m_k, \epsilon_{k+1})_{k \geq 1}$, be the three-interval expansion of (α, β) . Then there exists an infinite sequence of nested intervals J_k , $k \geq 1$, which have exactly three return words, A_k , B_k and C_k , given recursively for $k \geq 1$ by the following formulas*

form1

$$(2.2) \quad A_k = A_{k-1}^{n_k-1} C_{k-1} B_{k-1}^{m_k-1} A_{k-1},$$

form2

$$(2.3) \quad B_k = A_{k-1}^{n_k-1} C_{k-1} B_{k-1}^{m_k}$$

form3

$$(2.4) \quad C_k = A_{k-1}^{n_k-1} C_{k-1} B_{k-1}^{m_k-1}$$

if $\epsilon_{k+1} = +1$, and

form4

$$(2.5) \quad A_k = A_{k-1}^{n_k-1} C_{k-1} B_{k-1}^{m_k},$$

form5

$$(2.6) \quad B_k = A_{k-1}^{n_k-1} C_{k-1} B_{k-1}^{m_k-1} A_{k-1}$$

form6

$$(2.7) \quad C_k = A_{k-1}^{n_k-1} C_{k-1} B_{k-1}^{m_k-1} A_{k-1}$$

if $\epsilon_{k+1} = -1$. The initial words A_0, B_0, C_0 satisfy $||A_0| - |B_0|| = 1$.

Let $a_k = |A_k|$, $b_k = |B_k|$, $c_k = |C_k|$. Note that $|a_k - b_k| = |a_{k-1} - b_{k-1}| = 1$ and $c_k \leq 2a_k$.

Remark 2. In [6] Eskin and Chaika show, that for three interval exchange maps satisfying the conditions (A0)–(A9) (page 3), Sarnak's conjecture holds. We want to note, that their approach is also based on the fact that three interval exchange maps can be induced from a two interval exchange map. The numbers $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, in conditions (A0)–(A9), are the continued fractions of the rotation number of the two interval exchange map which induces the three interval exchange map with parameters (α, β) . In our case this corresponds to the number $A(\alpha, \beta)$ (see (2.1)), hence the

continued fractions of $A(\alpha, \beta)$ are the numbers $\{a_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ and from (2) it is easy to see, that they are related to the numbers $\{(n_k + m_k)\}_{k=1}^\infty$. However in Bourgain's approach this numbers are required to be sufficiently large (see Theorem 4), while the conditions (A0)–(A9) essentially give upper bounds.

Using the dynamical descriptions of trajectories in [10], Bourgain [5], proves Sarnak's disjointness conjectures for a certain class of three interval exchange maps. Now we recall the statement of his theorem.

Consider a symbolic system on the alphabet V with finitely many symbols and with order- n words $W \in \mathcal{W}_n$ of the form

$$\text{f11} \quad (2.8) \quad W = W_1^{k_1} W_2^{k_2} \cdots W_r^{k_r} \text{ for some } W_1, W_2, \dots, W_r \in \mathcal{W}'_{n-1} = \bigcup_{m < n} \mathcal{W}_m,$$

where it is assumed that r remains uniformly bounded, $r < C$. It is also assumed the following property for the system $\{W_n\}$. For $W \in \mathcal{W}_n$, which is expressed in words $W' \in \mathcal{W}_{n-s}$, $0 < s \leq n$, by iteration of (2.8) we have,

$$\text{f12} \quad (2.9) \quad \frac{|W|}{\max |W'|} > \beta(s),$$

where

$$\text{f13} \quad (2.10) \quad \beta(s) > C_0^s,$$

for some large s and for some sufficiently large constant C_0 .

thm **Theorem 3** ([5, Theorem 2, page 126]). *Let $\{W_n; n \geq 1\}$ be a symbolic system with properties (2.8)-(2.10) and σ be the shift on the system. Then, if $W \in \bigcup \mathcal{W}_n$ and $|W| = N$, one has*

$$\int_T |P_W(\theta)| \left| \sum_{k=1}^N \mu(k) e(k\theta) \right| d\theta = \mathcal{O}_A(N(\log N)^A),$$

for any $A > 0$, where

$$P_W(\theta) = \sum_{k=1}^N f(k) e(k\theta),$$

and $f(k) = f(\sigma^k(x))$.

To see how this implies Sarnak's conjecture we recall the following inequality, which immediately follows from Parseval's identity

$$\text{ident} \quad (2.11) \quad \left| \sum_{k=1}^N \mu(k) f(k) \right| \leq \int_T \left| \sum_{k=1}^N f(k) e(k\theta) \right| \left| \sum_{k=1}^N \mu(k) e(-k\theta) \right| d\theta.$$

and according to Theorem 3

$$\text{ident} \quad (2.12) \quad \left| \sum_{k=1}^N \mu(k) f(k) \right| \leq \int_T |P_W(\theta)| \left| \sum_{k=1}^N \mu(k) e(-k\theta) \right| d\theta \leq \mathcal{O}_A(N(\log N)^A),$$

which implies Sarnak's conjecture. For three interval exchange maps

$$\mathcal{W}_k = \{A_k, B_k, C_k\}.$$

One can see, that if m_k and n_k are uniformly large, then the conditions (2.9)–(2.10) are satisfied and as a corollary from (3) one gets the following result:

th1 **Theorem 4** ([5, Theorem 3]). *Assume $T_{\alpha,\beta}$ is a three-interval exchange transformation satisfying the Keane condition and such that the associated three-interval expansion sequence*

$$(n_k, m_k, \epsilon_{k+1})_{k \geq 1}$$

of integers fullfills the conditions

bou1 (2.13) $\min(n_k, m_k) \geq C_0, \text{ for } k \geq k_{\alpha,\beta}.$

Then $T_{\alpha,\beta}$ satisfies Sarnak's disjointness conjecture.

We note, that Bourgain's theorem is in fact more general than the way it is stated in Theorem 4. As it was mentioned above, in Theorem 4 it is assumed, that there is uniform expansion at each step, but as one can see from the conditions (2.9)–(2.10) it is sufficient to have this expansion after s steps, for some fixed s . Next we prove a proposition, which will allow us to rewrite the diophantine condition (2.24) below in more general form.

main-prop **Proposition 3.** *In Theorem 4 the condition (2.13) can be replaced by*

t1 (2.14) $m_k + n_k \geq 2C_0, \text{ for all } k \geq k_0.$

Proof. As we said for three interval exchange maps we have $\mathcal{W}_k = \{A_k, B_k, C_k\}$. From (2.9)–(2.10) it follows, that it suffices to show, that for any $W_k \in \mathcal{W}_k$ and $W_{k-1} \in \mathcal{W}_{k-1}$, one has

L12 (2.15) $\frac{|W_k|}{|W_{k-1}|} \geq \frac{m_k + n_k}{2}.$

One can check from (2.2)–(2.4), that

s1 (2.16) $|W_k| \geq (n_k - 1)a_{k-1} + c_{k-1} + (m_k - 1)b_{k-1}.$

Therefore

e2 (2.17) $\frac{|W_k|}{|W_{k-1}|} \geq \frac{(n_k - 1)a_{k-1} + c_{k-1} + (m_k - 1)b_{k-1}}{|W_{k-1}|} \geq \frac{(n_k - 1)a_{k-1}}{|W_{k-1}|} + \frac{c_{k-1}}{|W_{k-1}|} + \frac{(m_k - 1)b_{k-1}}{|W_{k-1}|}.$

We have, that $|a_k - b_k| = 1$ and $2a_k \geq c_k$ and $2b_k \geq c_k$. Hence

s2 (2.18) $\frac{a_k}{c_k} \geq \frac{1}{2}, \frac{b_k}{c_k} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$

Similarly

s3 (2.19) $\frac{b_{k-1}}{a_{k-1}} \geq \frac{1}{2}, \frac{b_{k-1}}{c_{k-1}} \geq \frac{1}{2}.$

Assume $W_{k-1} = C_{k-1}$, then from (2.17) and (2.19)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|W_k|}{|C_{k-1}|} &\geq \frac{(n_k - 1)a_{k-1} + c_{k-1} + (m_k - 1)b_{k-1}}{c_{k-1}} \\ &\geq \frac{(n_k - 1)a_{k-1}}{c_{k-1}} + 1 + \frac{(m_k - 1)b_{k-1}}{c_{k-1}} \\ &\geq \frac{(n_k - 1)}{2} + 1 + \frac{(m_k - 1)}{2} = \frac{n_k + m_k}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

So from now on we can assume, that $W_{k-1} \in \{A_{k-1}, B_{k-1}\}$. First, let $W_{k-1} = A_{k-1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|W_k|}{|A_{k-1}|} &\geq \frac{(n_k - 1)a_{k-1} + c_{k-1} + (m_k - 1)b_{k-1}}{a_{k-1}} \\ &\geq (n_k - 1) + \frac{(m_k - 1)b_{k-1}}{a_{k-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We want to show, that

$$(n_k - 1) + \frac{(m_k - 1)b_{k-1}}{a_{k-1}} \geq \frac{n_k + m_k}{2}.$$

Denote $\alpha_k = b_{k-1}/a_{k-1}$. Then

$$(n_k - 1) + (m_k - 1)\alpha_k \geq \frac{n_k + m_k}{2},$$

or

$$\boxed{\text{L11}} \quad (2.20) \quad \frac{n_k}{2} + m_k(\alpha_k - \frac{1}{2}) \geq 1 + \alpha_k.$$

Since we have $|a_k - b_k| = 1$, it follows that

$$(2.21) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \alpha_k = 1.$$

Now we assume, that $m_k, n_k \neq 1$. Then $n_k, m_k \geq 2$. If $n_k \geq 3$, then from (2.20) we get

$$\frac{n_k}{2} + m_k(\alpha_k - \frac{1}{2}) \geq \frac{3}{2} + \alpha_k - \frac{1}{2} \geq 1 + \alpha_k.$$

If $m_k \geq 3$, then for large k 's

$$\frac{n_k}{2} + m_k(\alpha_k - \frac{1}{2}) \geq \frac{2}{2} + 3(\alpha_k - \frac{1}{2}) \geq 1 + \alpha_k.$$

In the same way we can show (2.15) assuming $W_{k-1} = B_{k-1}$. Now consider the case $m_k = n_k = 2$. From (2.17) we need to show

$$\boxed{\text{pro:1}} \quad (2.22) \quad \frac{a_{k-1} + c_{k-1} + b_{k-1}}{|W_{k-1}|} \geq 2.$$

Since $|W_{k-1}| = a_{k-1}$ or $|W_{k-1}| = b_{k-1}$, c_{k-1} is large for large k and $|a_{k-1} - b_{k-1}| = 1$, then

$$\boxed{\text{pro:2}} \quad (2.23) \quad a_{k-1} + c_{k-1} \geq |W_{k-1}|, \text{ and } b_{k-1} + c_{k-1} \geq |W_{k-1}|,$$

which implies (2.22). Now we assume, that one of the m_k 's and n_k 's is 1. First let $m_k = n_k = 1$. In this case, according to Proposition 1, ϵ_{k+1} can not be positive for infinitely many values of k , so we assume, that we have $(m_k, n_k, \epsilon_{k+1}) = (1, 1, -1)$. Hence W_k is defined by the formulas (2.5)-(2.7) and in view of (2.23) we will have

$$\frac{|W_k|}{|W_{k-1}|} \geq \frac{\min\{|A_k|, |B_k|\}}{|W_{k-1}|} = \frac{\min\{c_{k-1} + b_{k-1}, c_{k-1} + a_{k-1}\}}{|W_{k-1}|} \geq 1,$$

as $W_{k-1} \in \{A_{k-1}, B_{k-1}\}$.

Again from Proposition 1, it remains to show (2.15) for $(1, m_k, -1)$ or $(n_k, 1, -1)$, where $n_k, m_k \geq 2$. In the case of $(1, m_k, -1)$, from (2.5)-(2.7), we have

$$\frac{|W_k|}{|W_{k-1}|} \geq \frac{\min\{c_{k-1} + m_k b_{k-1}, c_{k-1} + (m_k - 1)b_k + a_{k-1}\}}{|W_{k-1}|}.$$

Since $c_{k-1} + a_{k-1} \geq b_{k-1}$, then one has

$$\frac{|W_k|}{|W_{k-1}|} \geq \frac{\min\{c_{k-1} + m_k b_{k-1}, m_k b_{k-1}\}}{|W_{k-1}|} = \frac{m_k b_{k-1}}{|W_{k-1}|} > \frac{m_k + 1}{2},$$

for large values of k , as $\frac{b_{k-1}}{|W_{k-1}|}$ tends to 1, when $k \rightarrow \infty$, and $m_k > (m_k + 1)/2$, for $m_k > 1$. Similarly, for $(n_k, 1, -1)$

$$\frac{|W_k|}{|W_{k-1}|} \geq \frac{\min\{(n_k - 1)a_{k-1} + c_{k-1} + b_{k-1}, (n_k - 1)a_{k-1} + c_{k-1} + a_{k-1}\}}{|W_{k-1}|},$$

and

$$\frac{|W_k|}{|W_{k-1}|} \geq \frac{\min\{n_k a_{k-1}, n_k a_{k-1} + c_{k-1}\}}{|W_{k-1}|} = \frac{n_k a_{k-1}}{|W_{k-1}|} > \frac{n_k + 1}{2}.$$

for large values of k . □

From this proposition we arrive at the following Theorem:

th2 **Theorem 5.** *Assume $T_{\alpha, \beta}$ is a three-interval exchange transformation satisfying the Keane condition and such that the associated three-interval expansion sequence*

$$(n_k, m_k, \epsilon_{k+1})_{k \geq 1}$$

of integers fullfills the conditions

bou (2.24) $(n_k + m_k)(n_{k-1} + m_{k-1}) \cdots (n_{k-s+1} + m_{k-s+1}) \geq (2C_0)^s,$

for all $k \geq k_{\alpha, \beta}$ and for some $s \geq 0$. Then $T_{\alpha, \beta}$ satisfies Sarnak's disjointness conjecture.

Now we turn to the estimation of the constant C_0 . In the proof of Theorem 3 Bourgain, first estimates the L^1 norm of the polynomials P_W , namely the Lemmas 3 and 4 in [5]. For the result it is also essential to slow down the growth of the L^1 norm of the polynomial P_W , whenever $|W_k| \rightarrow \infty$ (see lemma 4 in [5]). This condition is achieved by assuming that the lengths $|W_k|$ of the words in the symbolic representations (2.8) grow sufficiently fast, i.e. conditions (2.9) and (2.10). One of the key places where this is used is Lemma 4. To estimate how big the constant C_0 has to be we will follow Bourgain's steps and give more quantitative proof of this lemma.

First we note the following. Let $W_1 \rightarrow W_2 \cdots \rightarrow W_n$ be a sequence of words with $W_k \in \mathcal{W}_k$, where each W_k participates in the symbolic representation of W_{k+1} . Then according to the assumptions (2.9) and (2.10) one has

$$\boxed{\text{q1}} \quad (2.25) \quad \frac{|W_n|}{|W_{n-s}|} \geq \beta(s) \geq C_0^s.$$

In the same way

$$\boxed{\text{q2}} \quad (2.26) \quad \frac{|W_{n-s}|}{|W_{n-2s}|} \geq C_0^s, \frac{|W_{n-2s}|}{|W_{n-3s}|} \geq C_0^s, \dots$$

We note that there may be only finitely many indexes where the above inequalities do not hold, but that will not affect our estimates. Multiplying together the inequalities in (2.25) and (2.26) we will have

$$|W_n| \geq C' C_0^m,$$

which leads to

$$|W_n|^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq (C')^{1/n} C_0.$$

Hence

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} |W_n|^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq C_0.$$

Now back to Lemma 4. We observe that the proof of the lemma is based on the inequality (2.13), i.e.

$$\boxed{\text{mainineq}} \quad (2.27) \quad \int_0^{2\pi} |P_W(\theta)| \left| \sum_{j=0}^k e(jl\theta) \right| \leq C \log(k+2) \|P_W\|_1.$$

The proof of (2.27), in its turn, is based on Lemma 3. We note, that in the proof of Lemma 3, Bourgain doesn't use any particular property of the polynomial P_W and since the inequality (2.27) holds for any polynomial $P_W(\theta)$, we can assume, that $P_W(\theta) \equiv \text{const}$. So we will end up with the following inequality

$$\int_0^{2\pi} \left| \sum_{j=0}^k e(jl\theta) \right| \leq C \log(k+2).$$

We know

$$\sum_{k=0}^N e^{ik\theta} = e^{iN\theta/2} \frac{\sin((N+1)\theta/2)}{\sin(\theta/2)}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \sum_{j=0}^k e(jl\theta) \right| &= \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \frac{\sin((k+1)l\theta/2)}{\sin(l\theta/2)} \right| d\theta = \\ &= \int_0^{2\pi} \left| \frac{\sin((k+1)\theta/2)}{\sin(\theta/2)} \right| d\theta = \int_0^{2\pi} |D_k(\theta)| d\theta, \end{aligned}$$

where D_k is the Dirichlet kernel for which one has (e.g., see [28])

$$\|D_k\|_{L^1} \geq 4 \int_0^\pi \frac{\sin t}{t} dt + \frac{8}{\pi} \log k.$$

So we conclude, that

$$4 \int_0^\pi \frac{\sin t}{t} dt + \frac{8}{\pi} \log k \leq C \log(k+2).$$

Dividing both sides by $\log k$ and tending k to infinity we get, that

$$(2.28) \quad \frac{8}{\pi} \leq C.$$

Next we estimate the ε in (2.15) of [5]. For this we refer to the inequality (2.26) in [5]. In (2.23) and (2.24) Bourgain defines the minor and major arcs, which depend on parameters K and Q . Lemma 6 yields the inequality (2.25). For arcs which are sufficiently close to rational numbers with large denominators (i.e. when Q is large) or sufficiently far from the rationals with small denominator (i.e. when K is large) applying Lemma 6 one gets the inequality (2.25). Furthermore applying Lemma 4 and the inequality (2.25) we get

$$(2.29) \quad \sum_{\max(Q,K) > Q_0} \int_{V_{Q,K}} |P_W(\theta)| \left| \sum_1^N \mu(n) e(m\theta) \right| d\theta \ll_\epsilon (Q_0^{-\frac{1}{4}} + N^{-\tau/4}) N^{1+\epsilon}.$$

Or dividing both sides by N

$$(2.30) \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\max(Q,K) > Q_0} \int_{V_{Q,K}} |P_W(\theta)| \left| \sum_1^N \mu(n) e(m\theta) \right| d\theta \ll_\epsilon (Q_0^{-\frac{1}{4}} + N^{-\tau/4}) N^\epsilon.$$

Now from (2.12) Bourgain assumes, that $Q, K < N^\varepsilon$. But this is possible only, if

$$(2.31) \quad \frac{\tau}{4} > \varepsilon,$$

and from Lemma 6 we see, that $0 < \tau < 1/3$. So we conclude, that

$$\varepsilon < 1/12.$$

Now we return to the proof of Lemma 6 in [5]. To obtain the formula (2.15) Bourgain uses the inequality (2.27) to iterate the formulas (2.2)-(2.7), i.e. for $W \in \mathcal{W}_n$ one gets

iter

$$(2.32) \quad \|P_W\|_{L^1} \leq C \log(2+k_1) \|P_{W_1}\|_{L^1} + \cdots + C \log(2+k_r) \|P_{W_r}\|_{L^1}.$$

Iterating further the polynomials $P_{W_1}, P_{W_2}, \dots, P_{W_r}$ at step n we will get at most 4^n many members of the form

$$C^m \log(2+k_1) \cdots \log(2+k_n)$$

(we say 4^n since in the formulas (2.2)-(2.7) at most 4 subwords appear). Now using, the geometric arithmetic-mean inequality one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
\log(2 + k_1) \cdots \log(2 + k_n) &\leq \left(\frac{\log(2 + k_1) + \cdots + \log(2 + k_n)}{n} \right)^n \\
&= \left(\frac{\log(2 + k_1) \cdots (2 + k_n)}{n} \right)^n \\
&= \left(\frac{\log(k_1 \cdots k_n) + \log(\frac{2}{k_1} + 1) \cdots (\frac{2}{k_n} + 1)}{n} \right)^n \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\log |W| + \log(\frac{2}{1} + 1) \cdots (\frac{2}{1} + 1)}{n} \right)^n \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\log |W| + n \log 3}{n} \right)^n \\
&= \left(\log |W|^{\frac{1}{n}} + \log 3 \right)^n
\end{aligned}$$

as

$$\log(k_1 \cdots k_n) \leq \log |W|.$$

Therefore

$$\boxed{\text{S:1}} \quad (2.33) \quad \|P_W\|_{L^1} \leq 4^n C^n \left(\log |W|^{\frac{1}{n}} + \log 3 \right)^n.$$

However we will neglect the coefficient 4^n in the above inequality (which amount to saying, that at each step of the iteration of (2.32) we have only 1 member, or W_{k+1} is a power of W_k). Note that it makes the left hand of (2.33) grow slower. So we will have the inequality

$$(2.34) \quad C^n \left(\log |W|^{\frac{1}{n}} + \log 3 \right)^n < |W|^\varepsilon.$$

And since $\varepsilon < 1/12$, then

$$\left(C \log |W|^{\frac{1}{n}} + C \log 3 \right)^n < |W|^{1/12}$$

or

$$C \log |W|^{\frac{1}{n}} + C \log 3 < |W|^{\frac{1}{12n}}.$$

Denote $x = |W|^{\frac{1}{n}}$. Hence

$$C \log x + C \log 3 < x^{1/12}.$$

Now consider

$$f(x) = x^{1/12} - C \log x - C \log 3,$$

and compute

$$\frac{d}{dx} f(x) = \frac{1}{12} x^{1/12-1} - \frac{C}{x} = 0.$$

For the critical point of x_c we find

$$x_c = (12C)^{12} > \left(12 \frac{8}{\pi}\right)^{12} > 24^{12}.$$

Then

$$f(x_c) = 12C - 12C \log 12C - C \log 3 < 0$$

so we see, that if $f(x) > 0$ for large x , then $x > x_c = 24^{12}$. But we know that $x = |W|^{\frac{1}{n}} > C_0$ so we arrive at the following claim

Claim 1. *The constant C_0 in Theorem 5 satisfies the following estimate*

$$C_0 > 24^{12}.$$

As we see the constant C_0 in Theorem 5 must be quite large. But in this paper we will only assume that $C_0 \geq 5$.

Now we are ready to formulate the main theorem of this paper

Theorem 6 (Main theorem). *Under the conditions of Theorem 4, Sarnak's disjointness conjecture holds for all $(\alpha, \beta) \in D_0$, for which their associated three-interval expansion sequence $(n_k, m_k, \epsilon_{k+1})_{k \geq 1}$ fulfils the conditions*

$$(2.35) \quad (n_k + m_k)(n_{k-1} + m_{k-1}) \cdots (n_{k-s+1} + m_{k-s+1}) \geq (2C_0)^s,$$

for all $k \geq k_{\alpha, \beta}$ and some large $s \geq 0$ and for the Hausdorff dimension of the set

(2.36) $\mathcal{P}_0 = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in D_0 : \text{which satisfy (2.35), for all } k \geq k_{\alpha, \beta} \text{ and some } s \geq 0\}$, we have the following estimates

$$(2.37) \quad \frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \log(\Lambda + 2)} \leq \dim_H \mathcal{P}_0 \leq 1 + t(\sqrt{\Lambda}),$$

where $\Lambda = 2C_0 - 2$ and the function t is defined in (9). In particular, if $C_0 \geq 5$, then

$$(2.38) \quad \frac{3}{2} < \dim_H \mathcal{P}_0 < 2.$$

Corollary 1. *The two dimensional Lebesgue measure of the set $\mathcal{P}_0$ is zero if $C_0 \geq 5$.*

3. ESTIMATES ON HAUSDORFF DIMENSION

We first recall the definition of Hausdorff dimension. Let X be a metric space. If $S \subset X$ and $d \in [0, \infty)$, the d -dimensional Hausdorff content of S is defined by

$$C_H^d(S) := \inf \left\{ \sum_i r_i^d : \text{there is a cover of } S \text{ by balls with radii } r_i > 0 \right\}.$$

In other words, $C_H^d(S)$ is the infimum of the set of numbers $\delta \geq 0$ such that there is some (indexed) collection of balls $\{B(x_i, r_i) : i \in I\}$ covering S with $r_i > 0$ for each $i \in I$ that satisfies $\sum_{i \in I} r_i^d < \delta$. Then the Hausdorff dimension of X is defined by

$$\dim_H(S) := \inf \{d \geq 0 : C_H^d(S) = 0\}.$$

We will need the following classical facts about this concept, (see, e.g. [26], Theorem 2).

Theorem 7. *If $f : X \rightarrow f(X)$ is a Lipschitz map, then $\dim_H(f(X)) \leq \dim_H(X)$.*

Theorem 8. *If X_i is a countable collection of sets with $\dim_H(X_i) \leq d$, then $\dim_H(\cup_i X_i) = \sup_i \dim_H X_i \leq d$.*

Next we prove the following proposition

Proposition 4. *Let $H \in \mathcal{H}$, then H^{-1} maps D_0 into D_0 and it is a Lipschitz map.*

Proof. It is enough to show this for the maps F and G . By definition D_0 is the region bounded by the lines $y = 0$, $x = 0$, and $x + y = 1$. The inverse of F and G can be computed as

$$F^{-1}(x_1, y_2) = \left(\frac{1}{2 - x_1}, \frac{y_1}{2 - x_1} \right),$$

and

$$G^{-1}(x_1, y_2) = (1 - x_1 - y_2, y_2).$$

If $x_1 + y_1 \leq 1$, then considering the two coordinates of F^{-1} we have

$$\frac{1}{2 - x_1} + \frac{y_1}{2 - x_1} \leq \frac{1 + 1 - x_1}{2 - x_1} = 1$$

as $y_1 \leq 1 - x_1$. Hence

$$\left(\frac{1}{2 - x_1}, \frac{y_1}{2 - x_1} \right) \in D_0.$$

Similarly for G^{-1} , if $x_1 + y_1 \leq 1$

$$1 - x_1 - y_1 + y_1 = 1 - x_1 \leq 1,$$

hence

$$(1 - x_1 - y_1, y_1) \in D_0.$$

To prove that they are Lipschitz it is sufficiently to show, that the partial derivatives are uniformly bounded in D_0 .

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left(\frac{1}{(2 - x_1)} \right) = \frac{1}{(2 - x_1)^2} \leq 1,$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} \left(\frac{1}{(2 - x_1)} \right) = 0,$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} \left(\frac{y_1}{2 - x_1} \right) = \frac{1}{2 - x_1} \leq 1,$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1} \left(\frac{y_1}{2 - x_1} \right) = \frac{y_1}{(2 - x_1)^2} \leq 1,$$

as $x_1, y_1 \leq 1$. Since for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$, H^{-1} is a composition of Lipschitz functions, i.e.

$$H^{-1}(x, y) = G^{-t} \circ F^{-l_0} \circ G^{-1} \circ F^{-l_1} \circ G^{-1} \dots \circ G^{-1} \circ F^{-l_k} \circ G^{-s}(x, y)$$

then H^{-1} is also Lipschitz. □

Recall the following definition

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in D_0 : \text{which satisfy (1.26), for all } k \geq k_{\alpha, \beta} \text{ and some } s \geq 0\}.$$

Also define

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in D : \text{which satisfy (1.26), for all } k \geq k_{\alpha, \beta} \text{ and some } s \geq 0\}.$$

By definition

$$D \subset D_0.$$

Recall, that we have the following connection between (α, β) and the sequence $\{m_k, n_k, \epsilon_{k+1}\}$, (Proposition 2)

$$A(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = \frac{1 - \bar{\alpha}}{1 + \bar{\beta}} = \frac{1}{2 + \frac{1}{m_1 + n_1 - \frac{\epsilon_2}{m_2 + n_2 - \frac{\epsilon_3}{m_3 + n_3 - \ddots}}}},$$

where $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = H(\alpha, \beta)$, $(H \in \mathcal{H})$ and $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) \in D$. And if $(\alpha, \beta) \in D$, then $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\beta}) = (\alpha, \beta)$. Therefore, we have

$$\boxed{\text{c11}} \quad (3.1) \quad \mathcal{P}_0 = \bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} H^{-1}(\mathcal{P}).$$

maincor **Corollary 2.** Assume $\dim_H \mathcal{P} \leq d$. Then

$$\dim_H \mathcal{P}_0 \leq d.$$

Proof. According to Proposition (3.6), for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$, H^{-1} is Lipshitz 1. Therefore from Theorem 7 it follows

$$\dim_H H^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) \leq \dim_H(\mathcal{P}).$$

But from this, Theorem (8) and (3.1) we will have

$$\dim_H \mathcal{P}_0 = \dim_H \left(\bigcup_{H \in \mathcal{H}} H^{-1}(\mathcal{P}) \right) \leq d.$$

□

Therefore, to estimate the Hausdorff dimension of $\mathcal{P}_0$, it is enough to estimate it for $\mathcal{P}$, i.e. when $(\alpha, \beta) \in D$ and for this (α, β) 's one has the following relation

$$\frac{1 - \alpha}{1 + \beta} = \frac{1}{2 + \frac{1}{m_1 + n_1 - \frac{\epsilon_2}{m_2 + n_2 - \frac{\epsilon_3}{m_3 + n_3 - \ddots}}}}.$$

Now we recall the definition of regular continued fractions. For any $\theta \in [0, 1]$ its continued fraction is an expression of the form

$$\theta = a_0 + \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \frac{1}{a_3 + \ddots}}},$$

and its n 'th convergent is denoted by

$$\frac{p_n}{q_n} = \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \cdots + \frac{1}{a_n}}}.$$

With the conventions $p_{-1} = 1$, $q_{-1} = 0$, $p_0 = 0$, $q_0 = 1$, we have

$$p_{n+1} = a_{n+1}p_n + p_{n-1}, q_{n+1} = a_{n+1}q_n + q_{n-1}, (n \geq 0),$$

and

$$\boxed{\text{c1}} \quad (3.2) \quad p_{n+1}q_n - p_nq_{n+1} = (-1)^n, \quad (n \geq -1).$$

Let $\mathcal{I}^n = \mathcal{I}_{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n}^n$, where $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$ are positive integers, be the interval

$$\left(\frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \cdots + \frac{1}{a_n}}}, \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \cdots + \frac{1}{a_n + 1}}} \right),$$

that is

$$(3.3) \quad \left(\frac{p_n}{q_n}, \frac{p_n + p_{n+1}}{q_n + q_{n+1}} \right).$$

For $a \neq b$, we mean by (a, b) the closed interval with end-points a, b . This means, that we can also have $b < a$. From (3.2) it follows that the length $|\mathcal{I}^n|$ of $\mathcal{I}^n$ satisfies

$$\boxed{\text{c2}} \quad (3.4) \quad |\mathcal{I}^n| = \frac{1}{q_n(q_n + q_{n-1})}.$$

We will also work with more general kind of continued fractions, namely semi-regular continued fractions (SRCF). For $\theta \in [0, 1]$ its SRCF expansion looks like this

$$\boxed{\text{f1}} \quad (3.5) \quad \theta = \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{\epsilon_1}{a_2 + \frac{\epsilon_2}{a_3 + \frac{\epsilon_3}{a_4 + \cdots}}}},$$

where $\epsilon_k = \pm 1$ and $a_k \geq 2$ for all $k \geq 1$. For short we will write (3.5) in the following way

$$\theta = [\epsilon_1/a_1, \epsilon_2/a_2, \dots, \epsilon_n/a_n, \dots].$$

Note, that if $\epsilon_k = 1$ for all $k \geq 1$, then we get the regular continued fraction expansion of θ . The SRCF expansion is defined for $a_k \geq 2$, but we will also deal with the cases, when $a_k = 1$ or $a_k = 0$. It is also easy to notice, the following, if $a_n = 0$ and $\epsilon_{n-1} = \epsilon_n = 1$, then for some n , then

$$\boxed{\text{p1}} \quad (3.6) \quad [\dots 1/1, 1/0, 1/1, \epsilon_n/a_n, \dots] = [\dots, 1/2, \epsilon_n/a_n, \dots].$$

The following identity will be fundamental for us (see e.g. [18]). For $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $b \in N_+$ and $x \in [0, 1)$ we have

$$\boxed{\text{id}} \quad (3.7) \quad a + \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{b+x}} = a + 1 + \frac{-1}{b+1+x}.$$

Using this identity we are going to find the regular continued fraction expansion from their SRCF expansion. According to Proposition 1, if $(\alpha, \beta) \in D$, then

$$A(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\beta} = \frac{1}{2 + \frac{1}{m_1 + n_1 - \frac{\epsilon_2}{m_2 + n_2 - \frac{\epsilon_3}{m_3 + n_3 - \ddots}}}}.$$

In other words

$$\boxed{\text{b:1}} \quad (3.8) \quad \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\beta} = [1/2, -\epsilon_2/(m_1 + n_1), \dots, -\epsilon_{k+1}/(m_k + n_k), \dots].$$

To not carry the minus sign in (3.8) all the time in the computations we will simply replace the $-\epsilon_k$ with ϵ_k . So from now on (3.8) will look like this

$$\boxed{\text{b:2}} \quad (3.9) \quad \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\beta} = [1/2, \epsilon_2/(m_1 + n_1), \dots, \epsilon_{k+1}/(m_k + n_k), \dots].$$

where $\epsilon_k = \pm 1$. Now we will use the identity (3.7) to get rid of the negative ϵ_k 's. If in (3.9) $\epsilon_{k+1} = -1$ for some k , then from (3.7)

$$m_k + n_k + \frac{-1}{m_{k+1} + n_{k+1} + \frac{\epsilon_{k+2}}{x}} = m_k + n_k - 1 + \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{m_{k+1} + n_{k+1} - 1 + \frac{\epsilon_{k+2}}{x}}},$$

or

$$\boxed{\text{f2}} \quad (3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{1-\alpha}{1+\beta} &= [\dots, -1/(m_k + n_k), \epsilon_{k+2}/(m_{k+1} + n_{k+1}), \dots] \\ &= [\dots, 1/(m_k + n_k - 1), 1/1, \epsilon_{k+2}/(m_{k+1} + n_{k+1} - 1), \dots]. \end{aligned}$$

By definition $m_k, n_k \geq 1$, hence $m_k + n_k \geq 2$. Let k be the first integer, for which $\epsilon_{k+1} = -1$. Then from (3.10)

$$\boxed{\text{f3}} \quad (3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} &[\dots, -1/(m_k + n_k), \epsilon_{k+2}/(m_{k+1} + n_{k+1}), \dots] \\ &= [\dots, 1/(m_k + n_k - 1), 1/1, \epsilon_{k+2}/(m_{k+1} + n_{k+1} - 1), \dots]. \end{aligned}$$

This procedure is valid since $m_k + n_k - 1 \geq 1$ and $m_{k+1} + n_{k+1} - 1 \geq 1$. If now $m_{k+1} + n_{k+1} - 1 \geq 2$, then we can continue the procedure, as $m_{k+i} + n_{k+i} \geq 2$ for any $i \geq 0$. Now assume, that $m_{k+1} + n_{k+1} = 2$. If $\epsilon_{k+2} = 1$, then the procedure will continue in a normal way, since $m_{k+2} + n_{k+2} \geq 2$. So there can be a problem, only if $\epsilon_{k+2} = -1$. Then, from (3.11), we will have the following situation

$$[\dots, 1/1, \epsilon_{k+2}/(m_{k+1} + n_{k+1} - 1), \epsilon_{k+3}/(m_{k+2} + n_{k+2}), \dots]$$

$$= [\cdots, 1/1, -1/1, \epsilon_{k+3}/(m_{k+2} + n_{k+2}), \cdots],$$

$$[\cdots, 1/1, 1/0, 1/1, \epsilon_{k+3}/(m_{k+2} + n_{k+2} - 1), \cdots],$$

But according to (3.6), the last expression will be equal to

$$[\cdots, 1/2, \epsilon_{k+3}/(m_{k+2} + n_{k+2} - 1), \cdots].$$

Now, if $m_{k+2} + n_{k+2} \geq 2$ it is easy to see, that this is equal to

$$[\cdots, 1/(m_k + n_k - 1), 1/2, 1/(m_{k+2} + n_{k+2} - 1) \cdots],$$

otherwise we will be in the same. From here we can continue the procedure in the normal way. By this method we will find the regular continued fraction expansion of $(1 - \alpha)/(1 + \beta)$. Hence we will arrive at the following proposition

pro **Proposition 5.** *Let $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{P}$ and*

$$\frac{1 - \alpha}{1 + \beta} = [(2, 1), (m_1 + n_1, \epsilon_1), \cdots, (m_k + n_k, \epsilon_k), \cdots],$$

then for the regular continued fractions of $(1 - \alpha)/(1 + \beta)$, i.e. $(1 - \alpha)/(1 + \beta) = [a_1, a_2, \cdots]$ we have, that there is a number $s_{\alpha, \beta} \in \mathbb{N}$, such that for all sufficiently large n

$$(a_n a_{n-1} \cdots a_{n-s_{\alpha, \beta}})^{\frac{1}{s_{\alpha, \beta}}} \geq \sqrt{\Lambda},$$

where $\Lambda = 2C_0 - 2$.

Proof. First from the above discussion we know, that the procedure will stop if only $\epsilon_k = 1$ for all $k \geq k_0$. Otherwise the procedure will go on forever and eventually all the negative ϵ_k 's will be replaced with the positive once and we will get the regular continued fraction of $(1 - \alpha)/(1 + \beta)$. Since for each k , $m_k + n_k$ can participate in at most two replacements then it can be reduced only by two, and since during the replacement one also gets a new digits 1 (3.5), then taking into account the property (2.35) one will get the claim of the proposition. $\square$

By definition

$$\Lambda = 2C_0 - 2.$$

and since $C_0 \geq 5$, then

$$(3.12) \quad \Lambda \geq 8.$$

Define

$$S_0 = \{\theta \in [0, 1] : \theta = A(\alpha, \beta), \text{ where } (\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{P}\} = A(\mathcal{P}).$$

Notice, that the set

$$(3.13) \quad S = \{\theta \in [0, 1] : \exists k_\theta, s_\theta \geq 1, \text{ such that, if } k \geq k_\theta, \text{ then } (a_n a_{n-1} \cdots a_{n-s_\theta})^{\frac{1}{s_\theta}} \geq \sqrt{\Lambda}\},$$

from Proposition 5, satisfies the inclusion

$$(3.14) \quad S_0 \subset S.$$

It is not difficult to see, that for any $\theta \in S$

$$(3.15) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \sqrt{\Lambda}.$$

One can now see from Khinchin's theorem [23], that for sufficiently large Λ the Lebesgue measure of the set S is zero. Indeed, according to Khinchin's theorem

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n)^{\frac{1}{n}} = \zeta_0, \text{ for almost all } \theta \in [0, 1],$$

where

$$\zeta_0 \approx 2.68545.$$

Clearly for any $\theta \in S$

$$\boxed{\text{khin}} \quad (3.16) \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} (a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n)^{\frac{1}{n}} \geq \sqrt{\Lambda} \geq \sqrt{8} > \zeta_0.$$

if $\Lambda \geq 8$. Therefore the Lebesgue measure of the set S is zero. From this one can see, that the two dimensional Lebesgue measure of $(\alpha, \beta) \in D_0$, for which $A(\alpha, \beta) \in S$, is also zero. However this will also follow from Corollary 1.

Next we will estimate the Hausdorff dimension of S . In order to do so, we will need certain facts from [15].

Let

$$D := \{(t, q) \in \mathbb{R} : 2t - q > 1\},$$

$$D_0 := \{(t, q) \in \mathbb{R} : 2t - q > 1, 0 \leq t \leq 1\}.$$

For $(t, q) \in D$, define

$$P(t, q) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \sum_{\omega_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{\omega_n=1}^{\infty} \exp \left(\sup_{x \in [0, 1]} \log \prod_{j=1}^n \omega_j^q(\omega_j, \cdots, \omega_n + x] \right)^{2t}.$$

It is shown in [15], that $P(t, q)$ is an analytic function in D . Moreover, for any $\zeta \geq 0$, there exists a unique solution $(t(\zeta), q(\zeta)) \in D_0$ to the equation

$$\begin{cases} P(t, q) = q\zeta, \\ \frac{\partial P}{\partial q}(t, q) = \zeta. \end{cases}$$

In the paper the authors study the Khintchine exponents and the Lyapunov exponents, that is for $x \in [0, 1]$ the numbers

$$\gamma(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \log a_j(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log a_1(T^j(x)),$$

$$\lambda(x) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log |(T^n)'(x)| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \log |T'(T^j(x))|,$$

if they exist. In the above formulas T is the Gauss map, i.e.

$$T(x) = \frac{1}{x} - \left[\frac{1}{x} \right],$$

which is known to preserve the measure

$$d\mu_G = \frac{dx}{(1+x) \log 2}.$$

From Birkhoff's ergodic theorem we have, that

$$\zeta_0 = \int_0^1 \log a_1(x) d\mu_G.$$

For real numbers $\zeta, \beta \geq 0$ one considers the level sets of Khintchine exponents and Lyapunov exponents:

$$E_\zeta = \{x \in [0, 1] : \gamma(x) = \zeta\},$$

$$F_\zeta = \{x \in [0, 1] : \lambda(x) = \beta\}.$$

Then the following theorem holds.

t-func

Theorem 9 ([15]). *Let ζ_0 be the Khintchin constant. For $\zeta \geq 0$, the set E_ζ is of Hausdorff dimension $t(\zeta)$. Furthermore, the dimension function $t(\zeta)$ has the following properties:*

- 1) $t(\zeta_0) = 1$ and $t(+\infty) = \frac{1}{2}$;
- 2) $t'(\zeta) < 0$ for all $\zeta > \zeta_0$, $t'(\zeta_0) = 0$, and $t'(\zeta) > 0$ for all $\zeta < \zeta_0$.
- 3) $t'(0+) = \infty$ and $t'(+\infty) = 0$
- 4) $t''(\zeta_0) < 0$ and $t''(\zeta_1) > 0$ for some $\zeta_1 > \zeta_0$, so $t(\zeta)$ is neither convex nor concave.




Figure 1. Khintchine spectrum

Next we recall certain fact from pp. 27–29 in [15].

For any $\tau > t(\zeta)$ choose an $\epsilon > 0$ so, that

$$\boxed{\text{m:1}} \quad (3.17) \quad 0 < \epsilon < \frac{P(t(\zeta), q(\zeta)) - P(\tau, q(\zeta))}{q(\zeta)}, \text{ if } q(\zeta) > 0,$$

and

$$\boxed{\text{m:2}} \quad (3.18) \quad 0 < \epsilon < \frac{P(\tau, q(\zeta)) - P(t(\zeta), q(\zeta))}{q(\zeta)}, \text{ if } q(\zeta) < 0.$$

Such an ϵ exists, since $P(\tau, q)$ is strictly decreasing with respect to τ . Let $\mathcal{I}(n, \zeta, \epsilon)$ be the collection of all n -th order cylinders $\mathcal{I}_n(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, such that

$$\zeta - \epsilon < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \log a_j(x) < \zeta + \epsilon.$$

Let

$$E_\zeta^n(\epsilon) = \bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{I}(n, \zeta, \epsilon)} J.$$

For the set

$$\{J : J \in \mathcal{I}(n, \zeta, \epsilon), n \geq 1\} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_\zeta^n(\epsilon)$$

it is proved in [15], page 28, that if $\tau > t(\zeta)$, then

$$\boxed{\text{m:eq}} \quad (3.19) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{I}(n, \zeta, \epsilon)} |J|^\tau < \infty.$$

Now, for any $\zeta \geq \sqrt{\Lambda} > \zeta_1 > \zeta_0$ we can choose τ and ϵ in such a way, that (3.19) holds and

$$t(\zeta) < \tau < t(\zeta_1),$$

and

$$(\zeta - \epsilon, \zeta + \epsilon) \subset (\zeta_1, \infty).$$

Hence, in view of (3.19), for any fixed $\zeta \geq \sqrt{\Lambda}$, we will have

$$\boxed{\text{f:1}} \quad (3.20) \quad \dim_H \left(\bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} E_\zeta^n(\epsilon) \right) \leq t(\zeta_1).$$

Now let

$$A(\zeta, \epsilon) = \{x : \zeta - \epsilon < \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \log a_j(x) < \zeta + \epsilon, \text{ for infinitely many values of } n\},$$

then

$$A(\zeta, \epsilon) \subset \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{k=n}^{\infty} E_\zeta^k(\epsilon).$$

From this, (3.19) and (3.20) it follows, that

$$\boxed{\text{m:him}} \quad (3.21) \quad \dim_H A(\zeta, \epsilon) \leq t(\zeta_1).$$

Since for each $\zeta \geq \sqrt{\Lambda}$ there exist an ϵ_ζ , such that (3.17) and (3.18) hold, we will get a family of open intervals

$$\{(\zeta - \epsilon_\zeta, \zeta + \epsilon_\zeta)\}_{\zeta \geq \sqrt{\Lambda}},$$

which covers the ray $[\sqrt{\Lambda}, \infty)$. From this family we can choose a countable subcover, i.e.

$$\{(\zeta_k - \epsilon_{\zeta_k}, \zeta_k + \epsilon_{\zeta_k})\}_{k \geq 1},$$

for which

$$[\sqrt{\Lambda}, \infty) \subset \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} (\zeta_k - \epsilon_{\zeta_k}, \zeta_k + \epsilon_{\zeta_k}).$$

Consider the following two sets A_1 and A_2 :

$$A_1 = \{x : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \log a_k(x) = \infty\},$$

and

$$(3.22) \quad A_2 = \{x : \exists n_s(x) \nearrow \infty, \lim_{n_s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_s} \sum_{k=1}^{n_s} \log a_k(x) = \zeta_x, \text{ for some } \zeta_x \geq \sqrt{\Lambda}\}.$$

Taking (3.16) into account, one can see, that

$$S \subset A_1 \cup A_2.$$

If $x \in A_2$, then $\zeta_x \in (\zeta_k - \epsilon_{\zeta_k}, \zeta_k + \epsilon_{\zeta_k})$ for some ζ_k , hence

$$x \in A(\zeta_k, \epsilon_{\zeta_k}).$$

This will imply, that

$$A_2 \subseteq \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A(\zeta_k, \epsilon_{\zeta_k}).$$

This and (3.21) imply that

$$\dim_H A_2 \leq \dim_H \left(\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} A(\zeta_k, \epsilon_{\zeta_k}) \right) \leq \max_{k \geq 1} \dim_H A(\zeta_k, \epsilon_{\zeta_k}) \leq t(\zeta_1).$$

But since ζ_1 is an arbitrary number smaller then $\sqrt{\Lambda}$, and the function t is continuous, then

$$\dim_H A_2 \leq t(\sqrt{\Lambda}).$$

As for the set A_1 , one has

$$\dim_H A_1 = t(\infty) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore

$$\boxed{\text{final}} \quad (3.23) \quad \dim_H S_0 \leq \dim_H S \leq \dim_H (A_1 \cup A_2) \leq t(\sqrt{\Lambda}).$$

To estimate the Hausdorff dimension of S_0 from below we notice, that

$$\{x \in [0, 1] : a_k(x) \geq \Lambda, \text{ for all } k \geq k_x\} \subset S_0.$$

One can get this, if one considers the set of all $\{m_k, n_k, \epsilon_{k+1}\}$, where $\epsilon_{k+1} = 1$, and $m_k, n_k \geq C_0$. But according to Theorem 2 in [16],

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \log(\Lambda + 2)} \leq \dim_H S_0.$$

Combining this with (3.23)

$$\boxed{\text{fin1}} \quad (3.24) \quad \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \log(\Lambda + 2)} \leq \dim_H S_0 \leq t(\sqrt{\Lambda}).$$

4. PROOF OF MAIN THEOREM

sec:3

Proof. We have

$$A(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1 - \alpha}{1 + \beta}.$$

We want to estimate the Hausdorff dimension of the set $\mathcal{P}_0$. From (2) we have, that

$$\dim_H \mathcal{P}_0 \leq \dim_H \mathcal{P}.$$

For this we refer to a standard fact from the theory of Hausdorff dimensions. If $F : G \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $F \in C^1$, $\nabla F \neq 0$ for all $(\alpha, \beta) \in G$, then for any set $E \subset \mathbb{R}$ one has

haus1

$$(4.1) \quad \dim_H F^{-1}(E) = 1 + \dim_H E.$$

To verify this conditions for $A(\alpha, \beta)$ in D we compute

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha} A(\alpha, \beta) = -\frac{1}{1 + \beta}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} A(\alpha, \beta) = -\frac{1 - \alpha}{(1 + \beta)^2}.$$

We see, that $\nabla F \neq 0$ in D_0 . Hence, from formula (4.1)

$$\dim_H(\mathcal{P}_0) = \dim_H(A^{-1}(S_0)) = 1 + \dim_H S_0.$$

But then, from (3.24)

$$\frac{3}{2} + \frac{1}{2 \log(\Lambda + 2)} \leq \dim_H(\mathcal{P}_0) \leq 1 + t(\sqrt{\Lambda}).$$

According to Claim 1, $\sqrt{\Lambda} \geq \sqrt{8} > \zeta_0 \approx 2.68545$, then, in view of Theorem 9, we get

$$t(\sqrt{\Lambda}) < 1.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{3}{2} < \dim_H(\mathcal{P}_0) < 2.$$

□

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express his gratitude to Michael Benedicks for his guidance and valuable suggestions and also to El Houcein El Abdalaoui for many useful discussions and comments on the manuscript.

REFERENCES

A-K-L-1

- [1] H. El Abdalaoui, M. Lemanczyk, T. De La Rue, Automorphisms with quasi-discrete spectrum, multiplicative functions and average orthogonality along short intervals, IMRN to appear (2015).

A-L

- [2] H. El Abdalaoui, M. Lemanczyk, T. de la Rue, On spectral disjointness of powers for rank-one transformations and Mobius orthogonality, J. Functional Analysis 266 (2014), 284-317.

AKL

- [3] H. El Abdalaoui, S. Kasjan and M. Lemanczyk, 0-1 sequences of the Thue-Morse type and Sarnaks conjecture, preprint, Proc. Amer. Math Soc, 144(2016), no 1, 168-176.

- [4] J. Bourgain, P. Sarnak, T. Ziegler, Disjointness of Moebius from horocycle flows. From Fourier analysis and number theory to radon transforms and geometry, 67-83, Dev. Math., 28, Springer, New York, 2013.
- [5] J. Bourgain, On the correlation of the Moebius function with rank-one systems, J. Anal. Math. 120 (2013), 105130.
- [6] J. Chaika, A. Eskin, Mobius disjointness for interval exchange transformations on three intervals, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1606.02357>
- [7] F. Cellarosi and Ya. G. Sinai, Ergodic properties of square-free numbers, J. Eur. Math. Soc. 15 (2013), 13431374.
- [8] H. Davenport, On some infinite series involving arithmetical functions. II, Quart. J. Math., Oxford Ser. 8,(1937), 313-320.
- [9] A. Fan, L. Liao, B. Wang and J. Wu. On Khintchine exponents and Lyapunov exponents of continued fractions. Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Sys. 29(1) (2009), 73109.
- [10] S. Ferenczi, C. Holton, and L. Zamboni, Structure of three-interval exchange transformations I: an arithmetic study, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 51 (2001), 681901.
- [11] S. Ferenczi, C. Holton, and L. Zamboni, Structure of three-interval exchange transformations II: a combinatorial description of the trajectories, J. Analyse Math. 89 (2003), 239276.
- [12] S. Ferenczi, C. Holton, and L. Zamboni, Structure of three-interval exchange transformations III: Ergodic and spectral properties, J. Analyse Math. 93 (2004), 103138.
- [13] S. Ferenczi, C. Holton, and L. Zamboni, Joinings of three-interval exchange transformations, Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems 25 (2005), 483502.
- [14] S. Ferenczi, C. Mauduit, On Sarnak's conjecture and Veech's question for interval exchanges, Journal d'Analyse Mathematique, preprint
- [15] S. FERENCZI: A generalization of the self-dual induction to every interval exchange transformation, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 64 (2014), 19472002
- [16] I.J. Good, The fractional dimensional theory of continued fractions, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., 37 (1941), pp. 199228
- [17] B. Green, T. Tao, The Moebius Function is strongly orthogonal to nilsequences, to Ann. of Math. (7) 175, 541-566 (2012).
- [18] M. Iosifescu and C. Kraaikamp, Metrical theory of continued fractions, in Mathematics and its Applications 547 (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2002).
- [19] I. Jarnik, Zur metrischen Theorie der diophantischen Approximationen, Proc. Mat. Fyz., 36 (1928), pp. 91106
- [20] D. Karagulyan, On Mobius orthogonality for interval maps of zero entropy and orientation-preserving circle homeomorphisms. Ark. Mat., Volume 53, Issue 2, pp 317-327.
- [21] A. Katok, A. Stepin: Approximations in ergodic theory, Usp. Math. Nauk. 22 (1967), p. 81106 (in Russian), translated in Russian Math. Surveys 22 (1967), p. 76102.
- [22] M.S. Keane: Interval exchange transformations, Math. Zeitsch. 141 (1975), p. 2531
- [23] Khinchin, A. Y. Three pearls of number theory. Graylock Press, Rochester, N. Y., 1952. 64 pp. 10.0X
- [24] P. Sarnak, Mobius randomness and dynamics, Not. S. Afr. Math. Soc. 43 (2012), No. 2, 8997.
- [25] P. Sarnak, Three lectures on the Mobius Function randomness and dynamics, publications.ias.edu: <http://www.math.ias.edu/files/wam/2011/PSMobius.pdf>.
- [26] D. Schleicher, Hausdorff Dimension, Its Properties, and Its Surprises, <http://org.uib.no/hcaa/HausdorffMonthly.pdf>.
- [27] I. M. Vinogradov, Some theorems concerning the theory of primes, Math. Sb. N. S., 2 (1937), 179-195.
- [28] A. Zygmund, "Trigonometric series" , 12 , Cambridge Univ. Press (1988)